

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



The Historical Connections of the Hittites

Author(s): C. R. Conder

Source: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol. 4 (1889), pp. 41-65

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Royal Historical Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3678159>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 05:31 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press, Royal Historical Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*

THE HISTORICAL CONNECTIONS OF THE HITTITES.

BY CAPTAIN C. R. CONDER, R.E.

(*Read* June 1887.)

THE subject for your consideration in the present paper is one which has recently attracted attention, and which is of necessity destined to arouse controversy. I do not desire to weary you with dry details which must be carefully investigated and verified, or to make any reply to adverse criticisms, which as yet have served to show that the most careful demonstration of every point in a new thesis is required by modern scholarship. There are three separate questions to be considered, each of which might demand a volume by itself, and each of which might be independently considered. First, who were the Hittites? What do we know about them, and what bearing has such knowledge on general questions of history and ethnology? Secondly, what are the hieroglyphic texts of Northern Syria and Asia Minor? Is there any reason to suppose that all or any of them are the work of Hittites? and how are they to be deciphered? Third, what bearing have the two preceding studies on the Old Testament historical notices of the Hittites? Do they serve to support the general historical accuracy of the Hebrew Scriptures, or the reverse? I propose to confine my remarks in this paper chiefly to the first of these questions. The second has less bearing on history, and requires a great amount of study yet to lead to a solution. As regards the third question, most writers appear to be convinced, as I for one am most firmly convinced, that the Hebrew account of the Hittites agrees in

a most remarkable manner with the monumental discoveries concerning this sturdy race.

First, then, as regards the question who were the Hittites, and what do we know about them? For nearly a quarter of a century the Egyptian scholars have been aware that there was in Northern Syria an important people who are called Kheta on the Egyptian monuments. In 1866 the French scholar Chabas drew up a very valuable monograph on the subject. The work of examining the hieroglyphic references to this people has gone on ever since. It has been found that among the mixed populations of Northern Syria who contended with the great Egyptian conquerors of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties these Kheta played a most important part. The pictures at Karnak, the record of the great campaign, yet earlier, in which Thothmes III. won the battle of Megiddo, on the southern confines of Galilee; the curious papyrus relating the travels of an Egyptian in Palestine in the time of Rameses II., and other records, give us information as to the physical appearance and dress, language, religion, laws and customs of the Kheta, as to their political condition, civilisation, and warlike character, which is of the highest value. From these records, including lists of kings and of towns in the Hittite country, the Kheta are now almost as well known as Assyrians or Egyptians.

I may perhaps be allowed to say that I have studied these records for the last seven years in connection with the antiquities of Palestine, and all knowledge which I could gather from the best standard works and through correspondence with every scholar interested in the matter I have gradually amassed ever since 1880. In 1881 I made a special expedition into Northern Syria, with the object of discovering the site of the great city of Kadesh, the southern capital of the Kheta, and I believe that I was so fortunate as to find this long-lost fortress just where it is described to have stood by the court poet of Rameses II. The discovery, like all other discoveries, was called in question, but during the present year I have found it accepted in every work I have read on the Kheta or

on Palestine. Indeed, since the old name Kadesh still lingers at the site, since the Orontes still runs round it, as on the Egyptian picture, and since the historical references can be traced back through the Middle Ages and earlier, the identification of Kadesh seems to be demonstrated as clearly as such a topographical discovery is capable of being at so remote a period and from such scanty materials.

Turning from the Egyptian records to those of Mesopotamia, the discoveries of scholars have only of late years been put together in intelligible fashion by Professor Sayce. There are earlier students, but the writings of this scholar since 1880 have been the chief means of bringing out the fact that the Assyrians, pushing westwards over the Euphrates in the twelfth century B.C. and down to 717 B.C., came into collision in Northern Syria with the Khatti, a warlike people whose capital was at Carchemish—identified in a satisfactory manner with the ruins of Jerablus; the older conjecture, which fixed on Membij as the site, not being found to agree as well with the circumstances regarding Carchemish.

All those whose opinion is of authority have recognised, both in England and abroad, that the Khatti must have been the same people as the Kheta. This has, of course, been called in question, but the objection is not based, I think, on any solid ground. There remains the question whether the Kheta and Khatti are the Beni Kheth of the Bible. As to this, also, I believe there is no reason for hesitation. The words are radically the same; the land of the Hittites in the Bible is the same land—Northern Syria; and the earlier notice in Genesis of Hittites in Southern Palestine is not contradicted by any known monumental fact. The opinion of antiquarians generally favours the view that the Kheta, Khatti, and Hittites were all one and the same, and lived in the same country. This opinion is based on numerous facts, and I for one hold it to be demonstrated.

I proceed, then, to consider what we know of the Hittites from the sources in question; and first, as regards their personal appearance. We know how carefully the character-

istics of race are distinguished in Egyptian paintings, and we have pictures at Karnak which give us real portraits of the Hittites. The first thing which has struck all those who have seen the originals or the beautiful reproductions by Rosellini seems to be the Tatar-like aspect of the heads. The complexion is represented as lighter than that of the Semitic allies ; the faces are beardless, with a thin moustache like that of Mongols or Chinese ; and the heads, which are partly shaven, have black hair, with a pigtail, like a Chinese pigtail, behind. And, indeed, I think that anyone looking at the pictures in question would at once say, 'These people are Tatars or Chinese.'

The hairless faces of the Kheta distinguish them in a remarkable manner from the Semitic races as represented on the monuments. Indeed, to the Semitic people the beard has always been extremely honourable, and is so to the present day. When we find princes or deities represented without beards, the presumption is in favour of such representations being non-Semitic.

The physiognomy of the Hittites not only gives rough evidence of their Turanian origin, but it also serves to connect them with other peoples. Thus in Cappadocia the sculptures representing gods or kings give us the same type of hairless face. Dr. Isaac Taylor, who proved in 1874 that the great Etruscan race in Italy were a Turanian people closely resembling in language the Finnic family, has remarked on the sturdy figures, the high cheek-bones and oblique eyes, the black hair of the head, the hairless faces of Etruscan warriors, and has shown that these peculiarities connect them with the Mongols. The figure of an Etruscan was of the same build as that of a Cappadocian on the monuments—very different from the wiry, hook-nosed, bearded Semitic people of our own days.

Two curious peculiarities of dress—the tiara and the boot—which distinguish the Hittites were, I believe, first pointed out by Professor Sayce. The boot or shoe of the Hittite is the same now used by the peasantry of Asia Minor, and even of

Palestine. It is what we call a Turkish slipper with a curled-up toe. Professor Sayce points it out in Cappadocia, and finds it on the Hittite figures at Karnak. To this it may be added that what the Romans called the 'Calceus Repandus' seems to have been the same, and that it was of Etruscan origin; so that the so-called Hittite boot again links the Etruscans, Cappadocians, and Hittites with the existing peasantry of Asia Minor. As regards the tiara—a sort of long 'fool's cap,' such as dunces used to wear at school—it is not unlike, in some of its varieties, the crown of Upper Egypt. It also recalls the tiara of the Magi on monuments. It is found in Cappadocia, and the Dervishes of Syria to our own times wear just such a head-dress. The female figures in Cappadocia have a sort of cylindrical bonnet of similar character, which is still worn by peasant women in Bethlehem, and is something like the monk's head-dress in the Greek Church.

These indications are sufficient to make us look to the Turanian races for further information concerning the Hittites. It is hardly necessary to remind you what is meant by the term. Max Müller's 'Science of Language' is now a quarter of a century old, and it is the text-book for any who would understand aright the relationship of Asiatic races. In this standard work, you will remember, two great divisions of the Turanian race are mentioned—the South Turanian, embracing sixty-five languages now spoken; the North Turanian, fifty-one languages still living: making a total of 116, as against his enumeration of thirty-eight Aryan languages and the small group of eight Semitic tongues. Now out of this enormous number of over one hundred languages, the oldest known dialects of Mesopotamia and Media are (we are told) closely comparable to only two groups. The Akkadian and Proto-Medic have been considered by Lenormant, and by later scholars, to present affinities mainly to the Finnic, but also in some respects to the Turkic languages. I think it will be allowed that, in considering the old languages of Asia Minor and Media, we may put aside as not likely to be of great service the Tamil and other South Turanian tongues. They are languages of

the Malays, the Indians, and the Himalayans, and represent the southern migration of the Turanians.

The countries nearest to Asia Minor are the countries whose ancient languages we naturally first should study. Akkadian is known (though imperfectly) as it existed, say, in the time of Abraham, more than 2000 B.C., and it has even been called the Sanskrit of the Turanian or Altaic languages.

Proto-Medic is only known, I believe, after the destruction of the Assyrian Empire, but by grammar and vocabulary is closely related, Lenormant says, to Akkadian. If we were to select, say, Tamil as a proper language to study in connection with the earliest dialects of Asia Minor, it would be as though we relied on English rather than on Sanskrit in studying the older Aryan languages of the times after the Aryans left their Asiatic home.

It is for this reason that Akkadian seems evidently the most natural basis for comparison in case of a Turanian population of early date in Western Asia, and the name lists of the Hittites at least belong to a period when Akkadian was hardly extinct. What, then, is Akkadian? It is the old language of the 'mountaineers'—as the word means—who spread southwards from the region near Ararat into Mesopotamia. It is not as yet a very well known language. The pronunciation of even half its original roots, as occurring on the cuneiform inscriptions, is said by some to be unknown. This much, however, has been ascertained through the comparative labours of Lenormant and of those who have carried on his work. It is known that Akkadian is an early agglutinative language—that is to say, one which has passed beyond the first monosyllabic stage and has come to use grammatical attached syllables as well as roots standing for nouns and verbs. It is also known that Akkadian presents near relationship to the Finnic and more remote relationship to the Turkic groups of the Ugro-Altaic family.

Whereas the oldest Chinese represents, as stated by Max Müller, language in almost its earliest form, of roots each a monosyllable tacked together and distinguished as 'full' and

'empty,' to the west of China the languages grouped as Ugro-Altaic are more advanced, the weak roots becoming parts of speech tacked on to the noun and verb roots. The name Ugric, derived from Uigur or Ogre, refers to the Hungarian Ostiak and Vogul peoples; Ugro-Altaic designates what the Greeks called Scythic populations, descending from the Altai mountains into Media or moving westwards over Russia. These Ugro-Altaic languages are divided into five families—Tungusic, Mongolic, Samoyedic, Turkic, and Finnic; and out of these Akkadian, as before stated, is said to be nearest to the Finnic in the opinion of Lenormant, of Professor de Lacouperie, and of others.

The Finnic group, again, comprises four main divisions—Chudic, Bulgaric, Permian, and Ugric, according to the classification of Max Müller and of Dr. Taylor.

The most civilised language of the Chudic group is that of the Finns, or, as they call themselves, *Suomalainen*, 'fen dwellers'—a word said by Lenormant to be the same as Sumerian, the term which applied to the old Altaic dwellers in the Euphrates Valley as distinguished from the Akkadians or 'mountaineers.'

There is perhaps a good reason why Finnic languages should be nearer to Akkadian than any other. Civilised languages are much more permanent than those of rude tribes. Dialects change rapidly, but literary languages slowly. The Akkadians were a literary people; the Finns have produced in the '*Kalevala*'—the Turanian Iliad—an epic which is of primary importance to the student of Akkadian and even of Egyptian mythology. But, in addition to the preservation of a standard by such literature, it must be remembered that the Altaic languages all appear to have changed slowly. The old monosyllabic roots of Akkadian have been found to occur in very many modern dialects, not only Finnic or Turkic but even Mongolic, and some are said to be clearly recognisable in Chinese.

Taking Akkadian as the oldest known Altaic language, it is remarkable that affinities have been traced even in Etrus-

can. There are at least forty or fifty known Etruscan words which appear identical with Akkadian words, and had we a more extended knowledge of these languages we might perhaps find many more. The grammar of Akkadian and Etruscan, moreover, so far as it is possible to compare these languages, seems very closely similar ; and this grammar distinguishes the old tongues from the modern languages, Finnic or Turkic.

Now it has been recognised by Lenormant that there was a series of Turanian populations, stretching across Asia Minor in early times from Media to Lycia and Caria, existing in Lydia and Cappadocia, and akin, in his opinion, to the Akkadians. It is also stated by some ancient writers that the Carians and Lycians were closely related to the Etruscans, and a continuous chain is in this case established connecting Etruria with Chaldea and with Media. The evidence collected by Professor Sayce connects the tribes of Cappadocia, the Lycians and the Carians, with the Hittites, and if it be admitted that the Hittites were Altaic—which seems of late to have been recognised by several authorities as possible—it becomes, I think, clear that they must probably have formed only one link in this population of tribes which are independently said to have spoken languages akin to that ancient tongue generally known as Akkadian.

For these reasons I have for several years devoted attention to obtaining a general acquaintance with the statements of Lenormant and of other authorities as to the structure and vocabulary of the Akkadian, and the results have been to my mind very striking. We have, as before stated, twenty-five royal Hittite names mentioned in Egyptian hieroglyphic or hieratic texts ; and though there may be slight differences of opinion as to the pronunciation of some syllables, practically these are deciphered. In these names I believe we may see fifteen Akkadian words recurring, and three which are Etruscan and Akkadian also. Tur, Sar, Nazi, Essepu, or Esseb, for instance, are said to have been Akkadian names for chief or prince. Tar, Sar, Nazi, Essebu are sounds occurring in

Hittite names of kings. I have given a table showing this comparison, and showing in some cases how the words run through existing languages as well.

If we turn from proper names to geographical terms, we find no longer words for king or chief, but geographical sounds.

The Egyptian lists of places conquered in Northern Syria and Asia Minor include the names of some 200 towns. Here, constantly recurring in different combinations, we have, I believe, the Akkadian and Etruscan words for 'country,' 'hill,' 'river,' 'fortress,' 'house,' 'desert,' and, I think, also for 'tree,' 'camp' and 'field,' 'circle' and 'palace.'

HITTITE WORDS.

Names of Kings.

1. *Tar*.—Compare Proto-Medic *tar*, 'chief;' Akkadian *tar*, 'to judge;' *tur* and *dur*, 'prince;' Turkish *tura*, 'chief;' Esthonian *tara*, 'god;' Akkadian *dara* = 'god Ea.'
2. *Tarka*, *tarku*, *tarkon*, *tarkhu*.—Compare Akkadian *cu*, *khu*, *kha*, *khan*, *khun*, *ak*, *uk*, for 'prince;' Siberian *tar-khan*, 'chief;' Etruscan *tar-kun*, 'prince;' Tatar *kan*, 'prince;' Turkish *khan*, 'prince;' Chinese *kiun*, 'prince;' *koue*, 'kingdom' Proto-Medic *ku*, 'king;' *kumas*, 'royalty;' Akkadian 'high;' *uk*, 'man;' *ak*, 'male;' *cu*, 'man;' &c.
3. *Sar*.—Compare Akkadian *sar*, 'prince.'
4. *Tur*.—Compare Akkadian *tur* or *dur*, 'prince.'
5. *Tatar* or *Tiatar*.—Compare the word Tatar.
6. *Totar* or *Dutar*.—See the preceding. *Du* in Akkadian prefixed = 'make,' or 'go,' or 'become.'
7. *Isebu*.—Compare Akkadian *essepu*, *ispu*, or *esseb*, 'prince;' compare No. 11, Akkadian *sib*, 'prince.'
8. *Tas*.—Compare Akkadian *tus*, *tassak*, *tusgar*, *tassi*, 'prince' and 'hero;' and *tas*, 'to contend.'
9. *Senna*.—Etruscan *senna*, 'man;' Ugric *sena*, 'man;' Proto-Medic *shun*, 'royal' (in *shunki* and *shunkuk*); Akkadian *sul*, 'hero' (?).
10. *Lar*.—Etruscan *lar*, 'chief;' Akkadian *lul* and *rar*, 'king.'
11. *Sap*.—Susian *sap* and *sib*, compare Akkadian *sib*, 'king.'
12. *Lab*.—Akkadian *lab*, *lib*, 'king' or 'hero,' or 'brave.'
13. *Ak*.—Akkadian *ak*, 'king,' or 'male;' and *uk*, 'king.'

N.S.—VOL. IV.

E

14. *Mas*.—Akkadian mas, 'soldier.'
 15. *Nazi*.—Akkadian nazi, Susian nazi, 'prince.'

Topographical Words.

16. *Ma*.—Compare Finnic ma, 'country ;' Akkadian and Proto-Medic ma, 'country ;' also ma = ua, 'house.'
 17. *A*.—Akkadian a, 'water.'
 18. *Ab* or *Ap*.—Compare Akkadian ab or up, 'abode' and 'district ;' Proto-Medic up, 'city ;' Turkish ev, 'house.'
 19. *Ai*.—'Mound' or 'house,' Akkadian ai and e.
 20. *Air, ail, ar, aur*.—Akkadian ir, eri, alu, uru, 'city ;' Tatar aul, 'camp.' Primary root, ru, 'to found.'
 21. *Atir*.—Etruscan ater, 'hall ;' Akkadian tir, 'seat.'
 22. *Amar*.—Akkadian amar, 'circle,' 'enclosure.'
 23. *Au, aun*.—Proto-Medic eva, 'house ;' Akkadian e and ua or ma, 'house ;' Finnic huon, 'house ;' Turkic ev, 'house ;' Tscherkes unneh, 'house ;' Wogul inn, 'house ;' Akkadian un, unu, 'city.'
 24. *Ban*.—Etruscan phanu, 'fane ;' Akkadian ba, 'shrine ;' pin, 'city.'
 25. *Bek, bag*.—Akkadian ubigi, 'shrine ;' Proto-Medic Buk-ti, 'shrine.'
 26. *Bil, pil, pal*.—Etruscan falæ, 'hills ;' Ostiak pil, 'hill ;' Akkadian par, 'heap.'
 27. *Bur*.—Akkadian bur, 'mound ;' bur-bur, 'mountain.'
 28. *Kab, kip*.—Finnic kip, 'hill ;' Akkadian gubba, 'mound.'
 29. *Kan, gan, gin*.—Akkadian gan, gin, gun, 'enclosure.'
 30. *Kati*.—Proto-Medic kat, 'place.'
 31. *Gar, kar, kir*.—Akkadian kar, kir, khir, gir, 'fortress ;' Etruscan cære, 'town ;' Wotiak and Zirianian kar, 'town.'
 32. *Kaz, kiz*.—Akkadian giz or ges, 'tree,' 'wood.'
 33. *Khar*.—Akkadian khar, 'mountain' (Lenormant).
 34. *Maur, mur*.—Akkadian mur, 'brick,' 'stone,' 'clay.'
 35. *Nim, nema*.—Akkadian nim, 'high ;' num-ma, 'highland.'
 36. *Ped, pata* —Akkadian bat, 'fortress.'
 37. *Ria, aria, re*.—Akkadian ra, 'to flood ;' ria, 'flow ;' aria, 'river.'
 38. *Sak, sek*.—Akkadian sek, 'summit ;' sak or sag, 'head.'
 39. *Tar, tur, turi*.—Akkadian tur, 'abode ;' Ugric tur, 'stand ;' Akkadian tir, 'seat' or 'place ;' Turkic tura 'tent' or village.'
 40. *Tha* or *Ta*.—Ta, tai, Ugric, 'mountain ;' Etruscan te, 'mountain ;' affixed as in Hittite.

41. *Tasenu*.—Perhaps Etruscan thesan, 'sunrise,' *i.e.* East.
 42. *Thep, tub*.—Finnic typä ; Mongol dobo ; Turkic tepe ; Etruscan tepa, all mean 'hill.'
 43. *Zak, zakal, zagar*.—Akkadian zak, zik, 'house' or 'high place ;' zicara, 'high.'
 44. *Thuka*.—Compare duk, 'building,' tak, 'stone' or 'brick,' in Akkadian.
 45. *Zain*.—Akkadian zin, 'desert.'

The Akkadian words in this list are given by Delitzsch and Lenormant. The Etruscan and other comparisons are mainly from Dr. Taylor's 'Etruscan Researches.'

I am of course aware that there are great differences of opinion among cuneiform scholars as to many of these words, so that reliance is rather to be placed on comparisons less subject to dispute ; but it seems to me that by such comparison, and checking the words by their existence in Finnic dialects of later times, and considering the combinations, such as 'round top,' 'prince's house,' 'hill town,' &c., there is some ground for the conclusion that the language of Northern Syria must have been akin to that of the Altaic populations of Media and of Chaldea. The question is worthy of much more study than I have as yet been able to give it, and would require some time to work out finally ; but the evidence is already sufficient, I think, to show that the comparison is not unscientific. And when we consider how hopeless it is to extract out of the majority of these names any proper Semitic topographical derivation the contrast is striking. Scholars all agree, apparently, that these names are not Aryan nor Semitic, and if our comparison is limited to the study of the oldest languages we have nothing really left but Altaic dialects. For of the Georgian it may be observed that it belongs to a group of unclassified dialects of the Caucasus which are inflexional, and which, in the case at least of Georgian, have already, I understand, been perceived to have affinities to the Proto-Medic, an acknowledged Altaic tongue ; and there seems some ground for thinking that a comparison with older agglutinative languages is preferable to that with modern inflexional ones,

We know something about the Hittite religion from Egyptian monuments. Their treaties were confirmed by invocation of their gods. These gods are local and connected with the phenomena of nature. Set, Istar, the mountains, the rivers, the wind, the sea, and the clouds are invoked. We do not recognise any artificial pantheon, but that early belief, called Animistic, which is common probably to all Altaic races. As regards Set, he is recognised to be the same as the Egyptian Set, and is called 'King of Heaven.'

Among the Etruscans we have a god called Seth-lans, the latter syllable meaning 'God : ' and not impossibly Seth might be the same as the Hittite Set. Seth, Dr. Taylor shows to mean 'fire,' and in Egypt the colour of Set was red. The Etruscan god answered to Vulcan. The name also appears in Egyptian as Sutech with a guttural ending, just as we have 'nit' and 'nitakh' both for 'male' in Akkadian ; but Chabas has shown the existence of the simpler form. Lenormant connects an Assyrian god Shita with Set. As regards Istar, she is no doubt the mother goddess represented alike in Syria, in Asia Minor, and in Babylonia. Whatever be the true origin of the name, the adoration of this goddess connects the Hittites more or less with Babylonia.

The Cappadocian monuments tell a similar tale. In general character the deities recall those of Mesopotamia. We find, for instance, the winged Sun represented in Cappadocia. Further west, at Ibreez, the gigantic figure of a god wears a horned head-dress like that of Ea. The lion-headed Nirgal has also been found quite recently represented in Asia Minor. It seems to me that there is already evidence to show that the religion of the Hittites may have been akin to that of both Akkadians and Etruscans. In Cappadocia one deity holds a two-headed axe ; and though too much reliance must not be placed on such resemblances, it is worthy of notice that the Etruscan Vulcan on one of the mirrors carries the same axe, which may be compared with Thor's hammer.

There is a great deal of information to be collected from classic and other sources concerning the local gods of Asia

Minor. The god Tar or Tarku, for instance, mentioned by Professor Sayce, recalls the Esthonian word Tara for 'God,' and the name Dara for the god Ea.

Possibly some of the Phœnician deities whose names cannot be easily rendered as Semitic words are Turanian, and may have been originally Hittite. Tammuz, Nirgal, and Istar (under the Semitic form Ashtoreth) were Akkadian deities adored in Phœnicia. Such a god as Baal Sillik suggests the Akkadian deities Silik-mulu-khi, 'doer of good to men' (as Lenormant renders it), and Silik-ma, 'preserver of the land,' according to Professor Sayce's translation. There are a good many other instances among the inscriptions in the great 'Corpus' of Semitic texts which Renan has not rendered as Semitic.

The evidence of physical character, language, and religion thus seems to agree in showing the possibly Altaic origin of the Hittites. Such evidence is cumulative, and, even after allowing for many errors, it seems to me that a solid body of evidence must be left which will lead us to conclusions resting on independent and accordant facts. The study of the Hittite religion is specially important. We have many acknowledged portraits of their gods and some names of the same, and as we know a good deal about the mythology of Akkadians, Egyptians, Finns, and Etruscans, and something about the mythology of Phrygia and other parts of Asia Minor, the comparative study is not difficult.

The civilisation of the Kheta in the fourteenth century B.C. was very far advanced. They were ruled by kings whose daughters the Pharaohs were not ashamed to wed. They possessed fortresses, chariots, works of art in metal and in stone. They had scribes, skilled workmen, and slaves. Their armies included Semitic subjects; they concluded treaties of extradition and for offensive and defensive purposes, and seem to have represented the chief power in the north of Syria. Many people are sceptical about a Hittite empire; but, that alliances between various princes of the Hittites and kindred tribes for the purpose of withstanding Egyptian

conquests were made is matter of history ; and it is possible that some permanent confederation of the chiefs of Kadesh, Aleppo, Carchemish, and other important places may have then existed.

A people who could stipulate for the extradition of criminals, for the protection of their own subjects, 'skilled workmen,' in foreign lands, who admitted foreign workmen, and gave up foreign criminals, and who forbade the punishment of a family for the fault of an individual, were not mere barbarous warriors. All these stipulations occur in the famous treaty between the Hittite king and Rameses II.

The use of chariots and horses by the Hittites is of interest historically and ethnically. It has been noted that the horse is not a sacred animal, in early times, in Egypt ; whereas among Babylonians, Phœnicians, and other Asiatic peoples Pegasus is a recognised sacred symbol. It has been argued from this, and from other indications, that the horse was introduced within historic times into Egypt ; and, indeed, the conquests of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties have been attributed to a new use of chariots, not before employed in war. The Akkadians called the horse 'beast from the East ;' and the home of the horse, in fact, is in the uplands of Central Asia. The Turkomans and Tatars of our own days are among the most celebrated horsemen in the world ; and with the westward spread of Altaic tribes the horse seems to have reached Syria and Chaldea.

I may note in passing that the chariots were very splendid, being plated with gold and silver. The use of such chariots in Syria is traced down to the times of the Byzantine Empire, and gold and silver chariots in Rome recall the plated ox carriages of Indian princes, such as the one recently exhibited in the Indian gallery of the Colonial Exhibition.

The Hittites appear, as Professor Sayce has pointed out, to have been great workers in metal. This does not distinguish them from others, but is, perhaps, rather a question of date. Homer describes the adornment of palaces and temples with precious metals among the Greeks of the earlier period.

Nebuchadnezzar in Babylon, Solomon in Jerusalem, lined their temples with gold. The Hittites had silver pillars, gold statues, and engraved their treaty on a silver plate. They appear also to have possessed works of art in bronze, such as are mentioned among the spoils taken by Thothmes III.

This again recalls the Akkadians, who not only knew the precious metals, but also, as we see clearly from an Akkadian inscription, were acquainted with bronze, and perhaps with other alloys.

The bronzes of the Etruscans are equally famous; and the Phœnicians very early possessed works of art, arms, &c., in this beautiful metal. The art of cutting in stone, and of making seals in hard stones, was early practised among Hittites, Phœnicians, Akkadians, Cappadocians, and Lydians, and from such seals and signets much valuable information is derived. Gold, silver, copper, tin, lead, bronze, diamond, lapis-lazuli, and other precious stones have Akkadian names; and the love of colour was common to Egyptians and Etruscans, and to the early races of Asia Minor whose temples were painted. Among Akkadians we have many known words for different colours.

I now turn to the second question—that of the hieroglyphic texts of Northern Syria and Asia Minor, popularly ascribed to the Hittites. I do not propose to speak of anything but the broad general principles of their study—those principles which cannot, I believe, be called in question. As regards the details, all I can say is, that I have been careful to state that any suggestions of mine are put forward tentatively, and I am, I hope, willing to be instructed by competent scholars; but at the same time I have not omitted to study to the best of my ability the works of those who are generally quoted as having done most to advance comparative study of Akkadian and of cognate languages.

The first question is, Can these texts be really Hittite? We shall be able, I think, independently to establish the language which the Hittites spoke, as before explained. We know that the Hittites had scribes, and that the majority of

the texts in question came from the Hittite country. If, then, it can be established that the language of the texts is an agglutinative Altaic tongue, more or less comparable to Akkadian, there will be no possibility of avoiding the conclusion that the majority of the texts may rightly be called Hittite.

Let us consider for a moment what the probabilities are. It may be laid down as an established fact that language and writing grow side by side. Each linguistic stage has its corresponding method of recording words. The earliest state of language gives us monosyllabic roots for nouns or verbs. Chinese has hardly, we may say, got much beyond this stage. The earliest human attempts at recording events took the evident form of rude designs like those of Red Indians, of European Cavemen, or of the Bushmen, whose pictures I have seen in South Africa.

Gradually language advances to the agglutinative stage, and becomes able to express singular and plural, the pronouns, the cases, and the moods of verbs, by particles, which originally were nouns, but which have now become abstract ideas. What was at first 'many' becomes the plural; 'male' or 'man' becomes 'he'; 'inside' becomes 'in'; and so on. To this stage, when the roots of nouns or verbs are still distinct and unchanged, a hieroglyphic system naturally belongs. The old sign for 'many'—a series of strokes—becomes the plural; the old sign for 'male' becomes the sign for 'he'; the old sketch of a door serves for 'in.'

But another step is taken when an existing hieroglyphic system recommends itself to a people speaking another language. The sign then gets two values—one its picture value, the other its sound value. If the grammar of the two languages is the same, it might be possible to read any text equally well in either language if written in pictures or in hieroglyphics. But suppose the grammars differ; suppose one says, 'I kill him,' the other, 'I him kill' or 'him I kill'—and in such distinctions we are told the safest test of language is to be found—then it becomes impossible to know how to read the text unless the language is certain.

This difficulty was met by the Semitic peoples in cuneiform by having a double system—a picture to explain put beside the sound ; just as the Chinese put two words together having the same meaning, in order that it may be clear which meaning out of many each syllable bears.

This same double system occurs in Egypt, and perhaps even in Egypt it arose from the fact that there were two or three languages known, which it was necessary to distinguish. Thus, when the Egyptian drew a cat beside the syllable *mau*, or a sheep beside another emblem *ba*, there remained only one reading and one meaning possible, and only in one language would the two agree. In the oldest form of writing the cat or the sheep alone would have occurred, and so long as there was only one language known, these signs would suffice.

We need only glance at the later stages. As inflexions began to appear in language the hieroglyphics were replaced by syllables. A picture of a man was enough as long as you had only the words *mans* for plural and *manly* for adjective ; but how could the picture express the words *man* and *men* ? It became necessary, then, to use two signs, *me* and *en*, *me-en* spelling men. Hence came syllabaries, which were formed by using the old hieroglyphics, or rather using a selection from among them, to express syllables. By this time the old pictures had become so conventionalised that it is not always easy to see what they were originally meant to represent. The syllabary was a clumsy contrivance. It required the use of at least five times as many signs as an alphabet ; but just as the language also was not yet developed to the fullest extent, so also the idea of an alphabet—an idea yet more abstract than that of a syllabary—was not yet conceived.

The most perfect stage of language is said to be that of the Semitic tongues, and hence very naturally the Phœnicians—the Semitic Phœnicians, that is to say, not the older Turanian race in the same country—conceived a system which fitted their language, and by selecting from the syllab-

baries about one sign in four or five at last produced the alphabet.

If we are confronted, therefore, by texts which have on them true pictures—heads of kings, or of beasts, or birds, &c.—we know at once that we have to deal not with letters or even with syllables, but with hieroglyphics ; and we also see that we have to deal not with a highly developed language like Hebrew, not with an inflexional language like the Aryan tongues, but with an agglutinative tongue. If we find traces of signs for the plural or for any such abstractions, we know that it is not a mere picture-writing which we must consider. Pictures might be read without knowing a word of the language spoken by the artist. The existence of signs somewhat conventionalised, scattered among the heads of beasts, &c., shows us grammar—grammar of some particular language ; and once this grammar is recognised to exist the arrangement of the signs may show us roughly what the language is. Then comes the question, Is it a double system like Egyptian or like the later cuneiform, or is it a single system without what are called ‘determinatives ;’ that is to say, pictures to check the pronunciation of the sounds ?

Studying the Hittite texts on these broad principles, which I do not think any scholar will call in question, we find two things. First, that there were evidently grammatical signs—it was not pure picture-writing. This Professor Sayce has already recognised. Secondly, the celebrated bilingual, which Professor Sayce was the first to recognise as such, shows that there was no double system at all events in that case. The language was then a native language of the countries where the texts occur, and the language was agglutinative. Guided, therefore, by the independent determination above explained of the fact that the Hittites were a Turanian people, we may conclude that the language of the texts was also perhaps Turanian.

Now the conclusion so reached, not by a mere assumption but inductively, has been admitted to be possible by many

whose opinion is of value. But if we have to deal with a Turanian system of hieroglyphics it does not, of course, follow that Akkadian is the key to understanding the sounds. Let us go back, however, to the bilingual. It consists of only five words—Tarkutimme, king, land, Er-me. They follow in the order given. First the proper name, then the title, then the two genitives. This is the Akkadian grammatical order. The genitive in Chinese or in Proto-Medic, according to Max Müller and Lenormant, comes usually before the nominative ; but in Akkadian the order is, *Singasid, lugal, unug*. ‘Singasid, king of Uruk.’ Not only is the order the same—viz. proper name, title, genitive—but the fact that there is no particle to represent the genitive is also an indication of a very early linguistic condition both on the bilingual boss above mentioned, and also in the Akkadian text in question. There is nothing, then, in the grammar of the bilingual to forbid a comparison with Akkadian. But there is, perhaps, a great deal more to be got out of the bilingual than this by aid of what are now, I believe, accepted facts. The Cypriote syllabary is to the Hittite hieroglyph as the hieratic is to the Egyptian hieroglyph ; it is the conventional emblem produced by generations of hasty writers, sketching more and more roughly the original picture, until the original idea is almost lost.

The explanation I have offered of the sounds on the bilingual is disputed, but I do not feel certain that it may not be finally received. The Cypriote gave the sound *ku* for the emblem shown by Professor Sayce to stand for ‘king ;’ and the sound *mi* (though I think the Cypriote sound is more probably *me* or *ma*, which I will not stop to explain) for the emblem which Professor Sayce shows to mean ‘country.’ *Ku* is Akkadian for ‘king,’ and *ma* is Akkadian for ‘country,’ according at least to Lenormant, and Delitzsch. If so, the words as well as the grammar of the bilingual are Akkadian.

Now the objection made to this proposal is as follows : *ku* is not Akkadian for ‘king,’ *ma* is not Akkadian for ‘country ;’ the words should be *anin* and *mat*. This is, no doubt, very formidable. *Anin* is a word for ‘king,’ and *mat* is a word

for 'country.' Of this there is no doubt apparently in the minds of any scholars; and Lenormant, who gives *ku* for 'king' and *ma* for 'country,' gives also *anin* for 'king,' *mat* and *murun* for 'country.' For because we say in English, Monarch, Sovereign, Ruler, that does not prevent our saying King; because we say Region, Country, District, that does not prevent our saying Land. Improvements in the study of Akkadian are constantly being made, and many words once supposed by great scholars to have been established are now differently read by the same scholars or by their successors. It cannot be denied that a certain emblem which is known to stand for 'king' is also known to have had the sound *ku*, and so for the rest. But the question is, Is it to be given this sound *ku* when it is rendered 'king'? The question is, in fact, Was there an old Akkadian word *ku* for 'king'? Now, I am only comparing sounds determined by great scholars with words which great scholars say mean certain things. Lenormant and Fox Talbot have told us in former years that *cu* is Altaic for 'king.' Lenormant and Delitzsch and others have told us for the last twenty years that *ma* is Akkadian for 'country.' But supposing these views to be not now held; supposing the scholars in question to cut out of all published works the words *cu* for 'king,' *pa* for 'sceptre,' *ma* for 'country,' and put *anin* and *gisdar* and *mat* instead. Supposing that such authorities as Norris and Lenormant, and Delitzsch and many more were wrong, then of course the comparisons will all fall to the ground. It is certain that a particular emblem was used both to represent *cu* and also to represent 'king;,' another represented a sceptre, and had the sound *pa*; another represented the sound *ma*, and appears to be used for 'country.' How can we possibly know whether to retain these sounds, or to prefer others which have been found to exist in Akkadian, when using the signs as ideographs for 'king,' 'sceptre,' or 'country'?

It seems to me that the test lies in certain comparisons by which the cuneiform scholars have formerly controlled

their readings in many cases. Whatever words may most commonly have been used in Akkadian among the many known Akkadian words for 'king' and 'country,' it is certain that old monosyllables like *ku*, *ma*, *pa*, &c., are primary roots of Turanian languages. Not only so, but they have survived unchanged to our own days in the living Altaic tongues. Lenormant has in many cases traced an Akkadian word as he read it through numerous Finnic and other Altaic dialects. In all the Finnic languages, Professor Isaac Taylor tells us, *ma* is the word for 'land' or 'country.' What we have to do is to take the sounds *ku* and *ma*, and to trace them through the various living Altaic languages, as Lenormant has traced many other Akkadian words, and to show that to the present day they retain the old sounds and the old meanings.

I believe that by aid of the comparative vocabularies of Donner and Vambery it will not be difficult to establish in certain cases the fact already recognised, that the monosyllabic sounds known in Akkadian are common, with very slight modifications, to a large number of Finnic, Turkic, and even Mongolic languages. It may be objected that we should not even then be able to show that Hittite and Akkadian were the same tongue; but the decision of that question will not rest on the words but on the grammatical construction, since the grammar of Akkadian presents a different order from that of modern Altaic dialects. I do not expect that the Hittite will be found to be exactly like any of the various dialects known from the cuneiform; I only expect that it will prove to be closely akin to them, and to contain the same primary and secondary roots, and a grammar probably nearest to that of the Akkadian.

I have in the list of Hittite names given a few such comparisons, but the demonstration must evidently be worked out in detail. Meanwhile the authority of Dr. Taylor seems sufficient to quote in defence of the word *ma* on the bilingual; and it may prove that Norris, Fox Talbot, and Lenormant were right in the old opinion that *ku* meant 'king' in Akka-

dian and in Proto-Medic. If anyone who looked at the emblems on the boss preferred to call them *anin* or *sar* or *mul*, and *mat* or *vurun* or *ki*, that by no means would prove that they could not be called *ku* and *ma*, which were the only sounds surviving in connection with these emblems in the Cypriote sketches if correctly compared. This is the reason why I think the criticism on my work, published ten days after the book appeared, may in the end not be sustained.

I will not weary you with further details. The same principles may carry us much further on. We should devote attention to those emblems which denote the cases, the plural, the pronouns, the voices of the verb, to the double sounds like *kaka*, *kit*, *meske*, &c. I think it may be found that the positions agree with the positions that such words should hold according to Akkadian grammar—the sounds being obtained from similar Cypriote emblems. There is only one scientific way, I think, of studying these texts. We must take each emblem separately and examine its position with respect to others in the groups of which it forms part, in order, if possible, to obtain a value for that emblem which will agree with *all* the occurrences. Then, having fixed what each sign means, and having supported that determination by every possible consideration, you may come to know that word. Treat every word the same way, and get, if possible, a separate idea of what each word means. Then begin to translate, keeping the same radical meaning throughout for the word, and sticking fast to your rules of grammar. Clearly this is the only scientific method. For the sign resembling the Cypriote *ne* I collected no less than fifty-eight examples, and from them it appeared to me that, if regarded as the Akkadian *ni* or *na*, meaning ‘male,’ ‘he,’ and ‘of,’ the position in every case of the fifty-eight would be a possible position. I took *mu* and treated it the same way in twenty-four cases with similar results, and so with the rest. This, surely, was the severest possible treatment, bound by the most severe rules possible, whereby a meaning could be established for

any word, from its picture value, its sound value, and its position combined.

Of course we are more accustomed to think of historical than of magical inscriptions. We know of Nebuchadnezzar's historical tablets and of Sennacherib's account—a very diplomatic representation of facts—of his attack on Hezekiah ; but these tablets of the eighth and sixth centuries B.C. are modern as compared with the old magic texts of Egypt and of the Akkadians. Some of the most wonderful work done of late years has been that accomplished by Renouf in investigating the Egyptian Book of the Dead. His familiarity with the labours of Max Müller on the Vedas has enabled him to explain Egyptian mythology as it has never been explained before. I have studied with care his papers on this subject, and I believe that the key to a right understanding of Akkadian or of Hittite religion lies in comparative study. From the folk-lore of Bengal, the Finnish 'Kalevala,' the Mongol tales, collected by Gubernatis, we may perhaps gather truer ideas of the belief of Hittites and Akkadians than from the learned disputes of scholars over a cuneiform syllable.

If there be any fundamental objection to these general principles, it will, of course, be impossible that any work founded on them should succeed ; but it does not seem to me possible that they are wrong, because whatever standard work one reads the same general principles are always met. My object is not to defend points of detail which may be shown to be incorrect ; but at present the agreement as to the texts in question has not even reached an agreement in principle. My object has been in the present paper to give a sketch of the Hittites as they appear surrounded by other peoples of various race, and to put forward considerations, which, I hope, may not be altogether unworthy of discussion, in favour of the Turanian character of the race and of a possible connection of their language with that of the oldest populations of Media and Mesopotamia.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. HYDE CLARKE said that Captain Conder was welcome in the Royal Historical Society, because they were desirous of prosecuting studies in the decipherment of ancient history, in which the English school had particularly distinguished itself, as with regard to cuneiform, to Egyptian and to Indian palæographic investigation. On this very subject of the Hamath inscriptions and their wide historical bearings, he himself had been allowed to read papers before the society, which dealt extensively with the whole matter. Captain Conder came before them distinguished by his labours and discoveries in Palestine, and on this other topic his paper, while premising the prosecution of the subject in the future, most modestly put forward his conceptions as suggestions to be hereafter examined and established. Perhaps he would have already obtained more definite results if he had trusted to his own powers of research, instead of accepting as authorities the loose propositions of others. In fact, although there had been very much writing about the Hittites, and people thereby supposed they were acquiring a great deal of Biblical knowledge, in reality that which they got was an extension of what Chabas had so long ago laid down as to the Khita or Kheta, and what he had himself written on the Turanian populations of the Mediterranean countries. Mr. Stuart Glennie had again come forward since his recent memoir to call their attention, as he himself had done, to the part the white Turanians had played in the establishment of the early forms of culture. It would be remembered he himself had gone so far as to propose an African highland migration centre for these white races, and treated as Turanians many of the populations of western Asia, now speaking Semitic or Indo-European languages. Availing himself of the latitude given by Captain Conder he hesitated to accept most of his conclusions. True it is that, as a matter of necessity in the constitutions of language, there must be relations between Akkad and the Khita group, but it did not follow that the ideographic texts in Khita were to be treated as Akkad. Of inflections there appeared only the plural mark, but that was not necessarily to be represented by a sound. Besides, as in Georgian, a word might be employed with an optional genitive particle or be united as an absolute compound. In Tarkendemo there appeared to be a compound of three words and there was no need for an inflecting particle. Besides he wished particularly to point out this, that in the boss it was not to be assumed that the grammatical order of the cuneiform was the order of the Khita. By comparing

the Khita character of the boss with the corresponding form on an inscription at Carchemish, it would be seen that the order is not identical. The reasonable view to be taken was that of his paper on the 'Early Mediterranean Populations' in the society's Journal, and in conformity with the opinion of M. Georges Perrot, that the characters admitted of phonetic rendering in several of the Mediterranean languages. Further, his decipherment there given was palæographically, numismatically, and linguistically confirmed, that the first two characters were a Bull and a Lion, and the corresponding languages must be those in which the two animals were represented by Tara and Kun in the analogous syllables. Although he had originally proposed the relation between some Khita and Cypriote characters, he had never asserted that the sounds of the characters were identical except where the same language was used. Indeed, the coins and the Trojan, Cypriote, Hellenic, and other coins and gems, designated by some Hittite, showed by the rebus the reverse process, that where the sound was the same the emblems or objects were diverse. Captain Conder well said that he had found a large number of examples of the character he calls *Nē*, but he does not state that the sound varies. A main cause of failure in decipherment as yet has been the adoption of a narrow basis. In the first place a careful distinction must be made between race and language, for the latter is no test of race, and a language may pass to a succession of races, conquerors and conquered. A strong desire has been shown to fix on what is considered to be the Altaic group, although there is a mass of kindred languages distributed afar in the Eastern hemisphere. The Caucasus with its abundance of languages ought to give us some warning as to what must have been the ancient linguistic condition of these countries. In the Caucasus it is true many languages have been preserved, but of many other languages no near kindred can be found. Diagrams of characters show that, as he himself had stated before the society, characters identical with the Khita were to be found as widely distant as western China in the Lolo and Moso and western Africa in the Vei. These characters also exhibited features identical with the Cypriote and illustrated the languages preceding the Phœnician and the Hellenic. If the characters were so distantly distributed so may the words be dispersed. In a letter he had received from Professor Maspero on two Khita words he was able to trace them to a common repository in the neighbourhood of the Vei group, apparently connected by a Libyan channel. Mr. Clarke concluded by proposing a cordial vote of thanks to Captain Conder.